

This formulary is under attack by 'think tanks' that may receive a lot of money from drug companies. PhRMA wants to convince the American public that, like the children of Lake Wobegon, all drugs are above average and should be readily available to be marketed to all Americans at whatever price the companies want to charge. The fact is, most drugs—about 80 to 85 percent in recent years—are me-too drugs: copies of stuff already on the market that bring little or nothing new to the fight against diseases. There is no need to cover all these drugs on a formulary. Rather, by using a formulary to list only the safest, most effective drugs, a buyer can obtain huge discounts from the companies. An exceptions and appeals process can ensure that in those rare cases where a non-formulary drug is needed, it will be available.

Listing all new drugs on a formulary can also be dangerous, because many drugs are approved after only six months or so of testing on a few thousand people or less. As doctor and Senator FRIST has said, there should be a 2 year moratorium on the mass advertising of new drugs, because we really don't know how safe they are. Vioxx and Celebrex are classic examples of drugs that added little new but have unacceptable risks.

The VA formulary never listed Vioxx and Celebrex. Good for them. Vioxx alone has been estimated to have caused up to 40,000 unnecessary deaths and another 100,000 heart attacks or strokes.

But the Manhattan Institute has just published a paper by a Frank R. Lichtenberg who says he is a Professor at Columbia University's School of Business. The thesis of the paper is that because the VA does not immediately cover every drug, like Vioxx and Celebrex, veterans are starting to die earlier. The Professor includes in his paper one of the most hilarious, or saddest examples of sophistry I've ever seen. He plots on a graph the life expectancy at birth of all males, and shows it rising from 72 years in 1991 to 74.5 years in 2002. He also plots veterans' life expectancy, which rises from about 77.6 years to 80.5 years by 2004. But then he does something that, if he were a student, would earn an "F". He superimposes the two life expectancy lines in different colors on the same chart but uses different vertical lines to represent the two different populations. The Veterans' axis on the left starts at 77.0 years and rises to 81.5 years. The life expectancy at birth of all males axis on the right side of the chart starts at 70.5 and rises to 75.0. By doing this, he makes it appear to the quick scanner or casual reader (i.e., most of us), that Veterans are dying sooner than the rest of American males. Instead, Veterans are living 6 years longer.

The Professor deserves an "F"—and so does the drug industry for trying to libel the VA drug system.

We need a system like the VA's for Medicare. It would save us hundreds of billions of dollars in the years to come—and save us from the Vioxx's of the future.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK STATEMENT

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 6, 2005

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to serve this year as the Congressional Co-chair for the House of Representatives for National Bible Week, November 20 through November 27, 2005.

The Bible was foundational to development of our country. The English Puritans came to the New World to follow the Bible according to the convictions of their own consciences. Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 24 had what today would be considered Bible college or seminary educations. Only a few years later, in 1782, Congress itself authorized the printing of the Bible.

The Bible has found its way into everything from casual conversation—expressions like "by the sweat of your brow" and "the salt of the earth"—and myriad others all come from Scripture—to the landscape of America. From Corinth, Maine to Bethel, Alaska, the Bible has marked our national map.

More than any map, however, the Bible has marked who we are as a people. Earlier generations of Americans almost inhaled the words of Scripture as they inhaled the air. To read the inaugural addresses of our Presidents, from George Washington to George W. Bush, is to read repeated allusions to or quotations of biblical texts.

The Bible speaks to the uniqueness of man—that we are all made in the image and likeness of God. It speaks of the greatness of God—that He is the object of true worship, the fount of all blessings and the Redeemer, Lawgiver, Friend, Savior and Judge.

Historically, we have been a people of the Book. We lose our allegiance to and our reliance on the Bible to our grave peril.

The Bible can be hard to understand. Yet as the theologian R.C. Sproul has written, "We fail in our duty to study God's Word not so much because it is difficult to understand, not so much because it is dull and boring, but because it is work."

And it is worthwhile work. There can be nothing nobler than seeking not only to know the Bible's teachings but to know the Bible's God.

It was President Lincoln who said, "I believe the Bible is the best gift God has ever given to man. All the good from the Savior of the world is communicated to us through this book." Or, as Jesus Himself remarked, "Search the Scriptures . . . for they testify of Me."

Today, Mr. Speaker, I echo Abraham Lincoln's comments and urge my colleagues and all Americans to reacquire themselves with the Bible. As literature, it is unmatched. As philosophy, it is unparalleled. And as truth, it will make you free.

I commend the National Bible Association for its outstanding work to bring the Bible to the attention of all Americans of every faith and creed. And I am humbled by the opportunity to serve in such a way as to draw attention to this most precious of books.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN B. GABUSI

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 6, 2005

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John B. Gabusi, an Arizona native known nationally and internationally, who retired September 30 as Vice Chancellor of Pima Community College.

Mr. Gabusi was an accomplished administrator who brought excitement, enthusiasm and excellence to his endeavors and his relationships. He possesses a superior intellect, is extremely well informed, and has an amazing ability to analyze information quickly and accurately. He is a compassionate human being with a particular affection for the less fortunate. He extends his help quietly, hoping only that others will overcome obstacles and achieve success.

Mr. Gabusi joined Pima College in 1991. He established the economic development office, then moved on to create a government relations program. From there, he undertook a myriad of successful activities for the College. Among his other remarkable achievements was a marketing campaign that increased the school's enrollment by 30 percent over a five-year period and a counseling-mentor program that increased the number of area high school graduates who enrolled at Pima by more than 60 percent over a three-year period.

Mr. Gabusi grew up in the mining town of Clifton. He earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Arizona in 1964, and was studying for a Ph.D. in political science when, in 1966, he and classmate Earl deBerge created a Tucson polling firm known as Survey Research Associates. He departed the partnership in 1968 to join the staff of U.S. Representative Morris K. Udall, whose congressional district then encompassed the entire State outside of Phoenix and Maricopa County. His friend deBerge continued the firm, which now is based in Phoenix and known as the Behavior Research Center Inc.

He spent 23 years away from Arizona, most of the time in Washington, DC.

Mr. Gabusi walked the halls of Congress as a Udall aide, and served as Udall's principal staffer for the Postal Reorganization Act of 1971, the first step toward today's independent postal system. Mr. Gabusi managed four of Udall's congressional campaigns and directed the congressman's attempted bid for the 1976 Democratic Presidential nomination.

President Jimmy Carter reached out for his help in 1977, appointing Mr. Gabusi as Assistant Director for Management and Budget of the Community Services Administration. He oversaw a \$2 billion annual budget at an agency with 1,800 employees between Washington and 10 regional offices.

Two years later, President Carter chose Mr. Gabusi for another major position: Assistant Secretary for Management in the fledgling Department of Education. Among other things, he managed the inter-agency task force that designed and implemented all of the required systems to create the Cabinet-level department.

Both jobs required Senate confirmation and Mr. Gabusi was one of a handful of appointees to undergo that process on two occasions.

With the 1981 change in administrations, Mr. Gabusi departed government service for private enterprise. He spent 2 years as General Manager of Rural Ventures Inc., the economic development arm of Control Data Corporation of Minneapolis.

He returned to Washington in 1983, and spent the next 8 years as an economic development consultant on a national and international basis.

His emphasis was on providing technical assistance to foreign ministries, and special contracts, primarily from the U.S. Agency for International Development, sent him to El Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Panama. He also consulted with the governments of Egypt and Poland, and played a major role in establishing Poland's first retail banking system.

Back home, Mr. Gabusi provided economic development and government expertise to small businesses, Indian tribal councils, small cities and towns and one federal agency, the Economic Development Administration.

Mr. Gabusi has been struggling with renal cell cancer for nearly 3 years and it was with regret that he retired from Pima College. He was a positive and progressive force at the college and in every other venture he undertook.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 4241, DEFICIT REDUCTION
ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, earlier I spoke about how this legislation is out of step with mainstream American values. I would like to submit for the RECORD the text of a letter sent to every Member of the House from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops reflecting the misguided values that this bill embodies.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,
Washington, DC, November 8, 2005.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: When Congress began the process of developing the 2006 budget for the United States government last February, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops president Bishop William Skylstad urged Members of Congress to remember that budget "decisions will reflect not only economic policies but moral choices as well," and urged Congress "to give priority attention in the budget to the needs of poor and vulnerable people both here and abroad."

As the House now takes up its budget reconciliation bill, we write to reiterate the Conference's priorities and to share our views on how that bill may impact several key programs and the people they serve. We are guided by Catholic moral principles: respect for human life and dignity; the importance of family and the value of work; an option for the poor and the call to participation; and the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity. We also draw upon the Church's experience living with, and serving the poor among us. As perhaps the largest non-governmental provider of health care and

human services to vulnerable people, the Catholic community meets the poor in our soup kitchens, Catholic Charities agencies and health care facilities.

We are deeply disappointed by the budget reconciliation proposal before the House of Representatives, in particular, its lack of concern for children. Below are specific examples of programs that serve vulnerable people—often children—that will lose funds if this legislation passes in its current form.

Food Stamp Program: The House reconciliation bill includes harmful cuts to the Food Stamp program that will result in taking food away from people, including children, who are being helped now. This would be objectionable anytime, but it is particularly unfair at this time. Recently, USDA reported an increase to 38 million in the number of Americans suffering from hunger or living in homes that are on the edge of hunger. This includes nearly 14 million children. Nearly 300,000 people in low-income working families will lose Food Stamp assistance if this bill becomes law and some 40,000 children in those families will no longer be eligible for free school meals. Many of those denied Food Stamps will be legal immigrants. We were strong supporters of President Bush's successful effort to expand access to Food Stamps for legal immigrants in the last farm bill. We strongly oppose the effort to roll back this expansion, by making legal immigrants wait an additional 2 years for eligibility.

Health Care for the Poor: We recognize and affirm the sanctity of human life from conception to natural death and consider access to adequate health care to be a basic human right. No person should be denied access to needed health care because of inability to pay. We oppose the provisions in the bill that would allow states to increase the burden of co-payments, deductibles and premiums on Medicaid beneficiaries—including some children and pregnant women. Health care providers would be allowed to deny services to those who cannot pay these amounts. Another proposal would allow states wide latitude to choose which medical services it will offer to different groups of low-income people. It is important to maintain a federal standard of core benefits, necessary for the maintenance of good health, to which all Medicaid beneficiaries are entitled.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that these provisions will save \$6.2 billion over five years (and \$28.2 billion over ten years), precisely because they will cause people eligible for Medicaid to get less of the health care they need. This attempt to save money by making it harder for low-income and vulnerable people to get the health care they need is simply unacceptable.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: The House reconciliation bill includes the House bill to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) welfare program. We reiterate our concern that the House approach to TANF reauthorization increases the work requirements on all TANF recipients, generally single mothers, and repeals the rule allowing a lower work requirement for mothers of children under 6 years old. While the House reconciliation bill does include small increases in child care funding, the amount is insufficient to pay for current child care services given inflation, let alone cover the need for additional child care created by increasing the TANF work requirements. We are also disappointed that the bill does not restore TANF benefit eligibility to recently-arrived legal immigrants. However, we note our support for funding programs—separate from the basic block grant—to promote marriage and healthy families (although we believe it would be better to target this spending on marriage and family services for low-income families).

Child Support Funds: The House reconciliation bill cuts Federal funding for state child support services which will make it harder for states to collect child support for low and moderate-income families. According to CBO estimates, over the course of ten years families could receive \$21 billion less in child support payments. Child support payments can be crucial to the economic viability of some families, keeping them out of poverty and off public programs. They also encourage parental responsibility and can help to maintain the connection between children and their non-custodial parent. Undermining the collection of child support is not good for children or families.

Agricultural Programs: We are disappointed that the reconciliation bill reduces spending on key conservation programs. The bishops have stated that protecting God's creation must be a central goal of agricultural policies, and our conference supports policies that promote soil conservation, improve water quality, protect wildlife, and maintain biodiversity.

The bishops' conference also endorses targeting limited government resources for direct federal payments and other forms of domestic agricultural support to small and moderate-sized farms, to help them through difficult times caused by periodic price shocks or unpredictable natural disasters, such as the recent hurricanes. Limiting U.S. farm supports and targeting them to those who need them the most would also increase the possibility that poor farmers around the world would be able to sell their products and support their families. We would welcome efforts to begin the process of redirecting agricultural subsidies to those most in need.

We urge you to remember that the federal budget is more than a fiscal plan; it reflects our values as a people. Budget choices have clear moral and human dimensions. A just society is one that protects and promotes the fundamental rights of its members—with special attention to meeting the basic needs, including the need for safe and affordable health care, of the poor and underserved. In these difficult times, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops urges you to work for a budget that does not neglect the needs of the "least of these" in our nation and the world.

Sincerely in Christ,
Most Rev. NICHOLAS
DiMARZIO,
Bishop of Brooklyn,
Chairman, Domestic
Policy Committee.
Most Rev. JOHN RICARD,
SSJ,
Bishop of Pensacola-
Tallahassee, Chair-
man, International
Policy Committee.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 4241, DEFICIT REDUCTION
ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the value of finding additional spectrum